

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 6 are independent claims. Claims 1 – 6 are amended by this response. Claim 7 is cancelled in the present application.

Examiner Interview

Applicants' representative conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner in this case on August 7, 2008. During this interview, Applicants' representative clarified to the Examiner the differences between the present invention and the applied references. Specifically, Applicants' representative clarified to the Examiner that the contents of the service list, in the present invention, are determined based on the authorization level of the service list requestor. By contrast, the references applied generate comprehensive service lists with access attempts being granted or blocked based on authorization level. The Examiner agreed that this aspect of the present invention was different from the applied references and stated he would reconsider his interpretation of the references upon submission of a written response with clarifying amendments. Applicants therefore respectfully submit the requested clarifying amendments and related arguments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115142 by Brickell et al. (hereafter "Brickell") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,168 to Mighdoll et al. (hereafter "Mighdoll"). Insofar as they pertain to the currently pending claims, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 pertains to a digital service system that includes “a service-list generating device that, in response to the service-list request command, generates a service list, which includes service content and network address of said service server, from the data stored in the management table, based upon the service authorization level, such that the service content and network address information contained in the service list is determined by the service authorization level.” The Office Action admits that Brickell does not teach such a device, and instead relies on Mighdoll for this teaching.

Mighdoll discloses a method for “providing a document to a client coupled server.” (Col. 2, lines 37-38). Mighdoll uses a ticket-based system for authentication where information such as user name and email address is transmitted to the client in the form of an electronic ticket that allows them access to a certain set of services. The client submits the ticket to the services to determine if the user is able to access a particular service (Col 15, lines 1-19). Specifically, “the ticket includes all information necessary to describe the access privileges of a particular user with respect to all services provided by the server,” (Col. 15, lines 1 – 3) and “the client submits a copy of the ticket to the service” each time the user requests access to a service (Col. 15, lines 7 – 9).

Mighdoll also teaches that a separate list of service servers is provided to a client upon successful login, and that this list of services reflects services becoming unavailable or services coming on line or services being load-balanced. (Col. 15, lines 39 – 42). Mighdoll teaches that “a client is provided with both a ticket containing privileges and capabilities as well as a list of service providers.” (Col. 16, lines 9 – 12).

Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere does Mighdoll teach or suggest that the service list provided to the client is anything but comprehensive. Mighdoll’s teaching that “the client submits a copy of the ticket to the service” each time the user requests access to a service (Col. 15, lines 7 – 9) means that there is no need for Mighdoll to send anything but the full list of

services currently on-line to each client. Mighdoll contains no teaching or suggestion that the service list is related to the access permissions determined in the user ticket in any way whatsoever. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Mighdoll does not teach or suggest a service-list generating device that “generates a service list [whose contents are] determined by the service authorization level” as required by independent claim 1.

Claim 4

Independent claim 4 pertains to a service center that comprises, in pertinent part, “a service-list generating device that generates a service list [whose contents are] determined by the service authorization level.” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that both Brickell and Mighdoll, taken either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) are deficient with respect to independent claim 4 for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 5 and 6

Independent claim 5 pertains to a method of controlling a center server, and independent claim 6 pertains to a computer-readable medium having a program embodied thereon to control a center server, both claims requiring, in pertinent part, generating “a service list, which includes service content and network address of the service server ... wherein the service content and network address information contained in the service list is determined by the service authorization level associated with the service-list request command.” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that both Brickell and Mighdoll, taken either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) are deficient with respect to independent claims 5 and 6 for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, and 8 – 11

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, and 8 – 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1, 4, 5, and 6.

Summary

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that both Brickell and Mighdoll, taken either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) are deficient with respect to independent claims 1, 4, 5, and 6, and all claims depending therefrom. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Mighdoll nor Brickell teach or suggest generating a service list where the contents of that list are determined by a service authorization level, as required by all claims currently pending. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application; the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's representative, Tali Matlis (Reg. No. 61,592) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants